



USAID | LIBERIA
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



TRAINING ON BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS



OCTOBER 8–11, 2012

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech ARD

PREFACE

Effective natural resource management and rural development hinges upon a strong recognition of tenure and property rights. Development practitioners need to understand and communicate: 1) how property rights issues change as economies move through various stages of economic growth, democratization, and in some cases from war to peace; and 2) how these changes require different property rights reform strategies and sequencing to foster further economic growth, sound resource use, and political stability. The lack of secure and negotiable property rights is one of the most critical limiting factors to achieving economic growth and democratic governance throughout the developing world. Insecure or weak property rights have negative impacts on:

- Economic investment and growth;
- Governance and the rule of law;
- Environment and sustainable resource use, including parks and park land, mineral resources, and forestry and water resources; and
- Biodiversity and sustainable resource exploitation.

At the same time, robust and secure rights (along with other economic factors) can promote economic growth; good governance; and sustainable use of land, forests, water, and other natural resources.

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is making a strategic commitment to developing a stronger, more robust policy for addressing property rights reform in countries where it operates. “Property rights” refers to the rights which individuals, communities, families, firms, and other corporate/community structures hold in land, pastures, water, forests, minerals, and fisheries. Property rights range from private or semi-private to leasehold, community, group, shareholder, or types of corporate rights. As land is a main factor for economic production in most USAID-presence countries, it is the main focus of this Property Rights and Resource Governance Task Order under the Prosperity, Livelihoods, and Conserving Ecosystems (PLACE) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC).

The Property Rights and Resource Governance Project (PRRGP) is a five-year initiative implemented by Tetra Tech ARD (Contract number EPP-I-00-06-00008-00, Task Order number 2). The project was launched in September 2008 and is expected to be completed by August 10, 2013. The task order is managed by Tetra Tech ARD, on behalf of USAID. It is a mechanism of the USAID/Bureau of Economic Growth, Education and Environment/Land Tenure and Property Rights Division. Dr. Gregory Myers (gmyers@usaid.gov) is the task order’s operating Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR).

PRRGP’s Mission is to:

1. Expand analytical methodologies, tools, and training on property rights issues like common property, governance, gender, conflict, and climate change.
2. Refine and scale up use of property rights tools in response to emerging issues and needs by USAID and its partners.
3. Refine knowledge management systems to integrate and spur two-way flows of information between training, tools, and policy interventions.
4. Continue and expand technical assistance on property rights and resource governance to USAID missions and its partners.

One of the central objectives of the USAID Property Rights and Resource Governance (PRRG) Task Order is to build the capacity of United States Government (USG) staff and host country counterparts to effectively address property rights and resource governance issues in order to promote equitable economic growth, sustainable resource management, and poverty reduction. Training comprises a central component of the PRRG strategy to attain that goal, with more than 20% of the Task Order’s core budget dedicated to a Washington DC-based training of USG staff (Task 1) and courses in four USAID regions of support (Task 2).

Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development, USAID Contract Number EPP-00-06-00008-00, Property Rights and Resource Governance (PRRGP) Task Order under PLACE Indefinite Quantity Contract.

Implemented by:

Tetra Tech ARD
159 Bank Street, Suite 300
Burlington, VT 05402

COVER PHOTO: Tetra Tech ARD

TRAINING ON BEST PRACTICES FOR LAND TENURE AND NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN AFRICA

TRAINING COURSE SUMMARY AND PARTICIPANT
EVALUATIONS

OCTOBER 8–11, 2012

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	I
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	II
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW	3
2.0 EVALUATION	5
2.1 EVALUATION METHODS	5
2.2 EVALUATION RESULTS	5
2.3 MODULES.....	6
2.4 GLUT SIMULATION	7
2.5 OVERALL COURSE.....	7
2.6 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED FOR FUTURE REGIONAL COURSES.....	8
2.6.1 Improving Future LTPR Regional Short Courses	8
2.6.2 Practices from Liberia to Replicate in Other Courses	9
APPENDIX 1. TRAINING COURSE PARTICIPANTS	10
APPENDIX 2. BIOGRAPHIES OF TRAINING RESOURCE PERSONS	12
APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS.....	14

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CNDRA	Center for National Documents and Records Agency
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
DG	Democracy and Governance
EGAT	Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade
GLUT	<i>Gaining with Land Use Transactions</i>
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
LMS	Learning Management System
LPIS	Land Policy and Institutional Support Project
LTPR	Land Tenure and Property Rights
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PLACE	Prosperity, Livelihoods and Conserving Ecosystems
PRADD	Property Rights and Artisanal Diamond Development
PRRGP	Property Rights and Resource Governance Project
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

I.0 INTRODUCTION AND COURSE OVERVIEW

The Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Africa short course was held in Monrovia, Liberia between October 8 and 11, 2012. This was the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID's) sixth international course held under the Property Rights and Rural Governance Project (PRRGP). The short course provided 36 United States Government (USG) foreign assistance practitioners and representatives from Liberia, Malawi, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, and Uganda training that strengthens their knowledge and skills in addressing land tenure and property rights (LTPR) challenges in their region. The course was co-sponsored by the Liberia Land Policy and Institutional Support (LPIS) Project, which is implemented by USAID under PRRGP with funding from the Millennium Challenge Corporation's (MCC) Threshold program.

The key objectives included:

1. Exchange experiences and strengthen understanding of LTPR issues, best practices internationally and their application to programming;
2. Introduce LTPR concepts and approaches aimed at improving programmatic interventions in economic growth, food security, governance, natural resource management, conflict mitigation and climate change; and
3. Teach tools to address land tenure and property rights issues, or use land tenure and property rights interventions to strengthen economic development, governance, conflict mitigation and natural resource management objectives.

Of the 36 participants, eight were female, all attending from Liberia. Twenty-seven of the 36 attendees were from Liberia (11 from the Land Commission, six from USAID, three from the Ministry of Agriculture, two from the Center for National Documents and Records Agency [CNDRA], two from the Ministry of Interior, two from the Ministry of Justice, and one from the Ministry of Lands, Mines and Energy); two from Malawi; two from Sierra Leone; two from South Sudan; two from Uganda; and one from USAID in Mozambique. PRRGP originally had higher interest from other countries but due to funding and scheduling conflicts, these participants were unable to attend. The USAID participants (from both Liberia and Mozambique) expressed that they had wanted to attend this course for some time and were glad that it could fit into their schedules.

The course participants were from diverse geographic locations and technical backgrounds (USAID, Liberian government, government officials from other African countries, and members of civil society) and therefore brought different experiences and expectations to the training. Initial questionnaires indicated an interest in learning more about the nexus between land conflict resolution, natural resources management, and gender and vulnerable populations.

Modules were composed of two-to-four presentations discussing challenges and best practice approaches from the region. These presentations were followed by discussions and typically one group learning exercise. The modules and their objectives consisted of the following:

Module 1: Introduction to land tenure and property rights (LTPR) concepts: Objectives: (1) Develop common understanding of LTPR terms and concepts; (2) Introduce LTPR tools that will be used throughout course; and (3) share common LTPR constraints faced in countries of the region.

Module 2 – Land and natural resource conflict: How rights and access to land and resources can be the cause of conflict and can fuel conflict: Objectives: (1) Convey what we mean by resource-based conflict and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict; and (2) Share programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPS in a post-conflict environment.

Module 3 - Gender and vulnerable populations: Strengthening access to land and resource: Objectives: (1) Convey the meaning of vulnerability in the context of LTPR, why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS; and (2) Share the various policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources.

Module 4– Natural resource management: How tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources: Objectives: (1) Convey why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation and mitigation of climate change; and (2) Share tenure related programmatic interventions to promote sustainable resource uses.

Module 5 - Land policy and administration: A tool for managing property rights: Objectives: (1) Convey the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation, and articulate the pros and cons of both customary and statutory land governance institutions; and (2) Share programmatic interventions related to land policy and administration, and successful methods and technologies used in land administration.

In the case of the land markets and administration module, presentations were augmented by a three-afternoon-long educational simulation titled *Gaining with Land Use Transactions* (GLUT), which illustrated land market operations. Within the simulation, players were organized into teams representing commercial land users, social classes (rich, middle, and poor), speculators that own undeveloped land, government, farmers, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Each team had a specific set of goals to meet. Rules governing play were designed to resemble land markets operating in many developing countries with strong asymmetric information, weak taxation, outdated zoning regulations, informal settlements, and a general weakness on the part of the government to provide urban services.

For additional information on the course, Appendix 1 provides the course announcement, Appendix 2 contains the course agenda, Appendix 3 provides the list of course participants, Appendix 4 presents biographies of the training module coordinators and resource persons, and Appendix 5 includes participant evaluation results.

Course materials, presentations, and reports will be available at:

<http://usaidlandtenure.net/training/2012/10/monrovia-liberia/tenure-and-natural-resource-governance-in-africa>.

2.0 EVALUATION

2.1 EVALUATION METHODS

Participants filled out short evaluation forms on each of the five course modules, as well as on the GLUT presentation. These were completed immediately upon the conclusion of each module. An additional and more comprehensive form was completed at the end of the program to evaluate the overall course. A summary of these evaluations is included as Appendix 5.

The evaluation forms for the modules requested that participants rank their overall satisfaction with each presentation or session within the module, the degree to which the module met each of the stated module objectives, and the degree to which the module was relevant to the participant's work. Rankings ranged from one to five, with five being the highest score. Space was provided to allow participants to provide comments for each item they ranked, as well as provide overall comments on the module.

The form for the overall course asked participants to rank each module, the relevance of the course to the overarching course objectives, items pertaining to overall course content, specifics of course logistics, and their overall satisfaction and learning. In addition, participants were asked to elaborate on:

- The highlights of the course;
- Topics they would have liked to cover in greater depth;
- Topics participants felt too much time was spent on;
- Their preferences for a course with broad thematic coverage versus a narrower focus; and
- Additional suggestions.

2.2 EVALUATION RESULTS

The Liberia course was on par with USAID's other international courses: very solid, well organized, and the normal bell curve ranging from those who were very pleased to a small number who were less satisfied. Participants generally felt that they would like more time allocated for discussion and debate of the issues and that additional case studies or examples would help to explain the issues further. They also commented that they enjoyed the sessions that allowed for participation or were interactive. It kept them engaged in the discussion and they were better able to think through the issues. In general, more time should be allocated for the presentations and discussions.

The short course received generally positive feedback, and participants enjoyed the case studies and the more tangible examples of land tenure issues and programming. Many participants remarked in the evaluations or in passing that a field trip could help to illustrate the lessons or showcase success stories in Liberia.

The number of evaluations completed for each module and the overall course varied from 17 to 28. Many participants took the time to respond to each of the questions, including the qualitative ones on the

evaluation form for the overall course. Many also provided additional commentary to supplement their rankings on both the module and overall evaluation forms.

2.3 MODULES

Modules and their corresponding presentations were highly regarded, with most of the modules averaging a score between 4.2 and 4.6 on the overall evaluation. The exception was the gender and vulnerable groups module, which scored an average of 3.96. Participants were actively engaged in the discussions following that presentation and the presentation on understanding vulnerability and the rights of women and vulnerable populations received an individual score of 4.3 (the two videos following the presentation were also two of the highest ranking sessions); therefore, the dissatisfaction was likely in the integration into the other presentations and discussions. Participants could discuss gender issues all day and were actively trying to find workable solutions for their land tenure issues. David Bledsoe, the presenter of the gender presentation, has indicated that he will modify the presentation for future courses based on feedback that he received and areas that he felt could be strengthened.

The module that ranked the highest was the introductory module on concepts and definitions (4.62). The land and natural resource conflict module and the land policy and administration module tied for the second highest score (4.46).

There were a total of 15 technical presentations during the modules. The presentations scoring the highest were:

1. Land policy and administration by Mark Marquardt (4.59);
2. Urban land markets by Carlos Morales (4.59); and
3. Land and conflict prevention handbook by Mark Freudenberg (4.48).

The highest ranked non-presentation session was USAID's video on women's land rights, *A Ripple Effect* (4.65), followed by the discussion at the end of the morning of day two, which brought many of the concepts of the course together (4.62), and the BBC video on women's rights in Niger (4.55).

Table 3.1: Overall Course

Criteria	Weighted Average
Modules	
Module 1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts	4.62
Module 2: Land and natural resource conflict: How rights and access to land and resources can be the cause of conflict and can fuel conflict	4.46
Module 3: Gender and vulnerable populations: Strengthening access to land and resources	3.96
Module 4: Natural resource management: How tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources	4.23
Module 5: Land policy and administration: A tool for managing property rights	4.46
Relevance of Module Content to Course Objectives	
Exchange experiences, deepen discussion and strengthen understanding of Land Tenure and Property Rights issues	4.27
Learn Land Tenure and Property Rights approaches, best practices and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions	4.29
Overall Program Content	
Course module and objectives clearly stated	4.57
Content of the training program	4.42
Relevance of program content to your work	4.23
Presentation style utilized by course trainers	4.50
Format for presentations and discussions was appropriate to the material	4.15
Knowledge demonstrated by the course trainers	4.71
Logistics Coordination	
Pre-course logistical coordination	4.14
Logistics coordination during course	4.40
Quality of conferencing facility	4.00
Quality of conferencing services	3.77
Quality of accommodations and hotel services	3.63
Quality of the food	3.46
Overall training program experience	4.32

The commentary provided by participants on the modules illustrates some of their perceived highlights:

- “Modules 1 and 2 were very good and the highlights of hearing examples from participants from other parts of Africa during discussions was [sic] great.”
- “The highlights from the 4 day course: land markets - GLUT, land policy and administration.”
- “The land tenure and property rights framework tools and resources presentation was exceptional, the course content, discussion and lesson learned from various case studies were very valuable.”
- “Security of tenure rights and why the vulnerable especially women need special attention.”
- “The framework to harmonize the varied number of tenure systems is still a challenge; governments must demonstrate willingness to engage the customary system actively and transparently.”

Regarding criticism, several participants commenting on various modules noted that they would have preferred additional time to discuss and clarify issues. Many participants felt that more time could be allocated to additional discussion on the matrix and how it could tie into other topical areas (e.g., gender or conflict). Some felt that it would be helpful if more time could be provided for the small group exercise and to provide feedback to better flesh out the issues. Some of the participants were disappointed that they were not able to take all of the overlays home with them and felt that they should have access to the drafts.

2.4 GLUT SIMULATION

As part of the land markets and administration module, a three-afternoon-long simulation exercise took place as described in the Course Overview section above. Carlos Morales presented on urban land markets on day two of the course. Participants rated this presentation with an average score of 4.59.

Participants’ feedback on areas of the course that they found most and least useful contradicted itself at times. Most of the participants enjoyed the GLUT simulation and felt that it imparted important lessons for urban and peri-urban areas; however, they felt that the game lasted too long and recommended shortening it by a few rounds. Course attendance reached its low point on the afternoon of the third day during the second of three GLUT sessions. This can be attributed to general course fatigue; however, changes to the GLUT simulations may better engage participants in the future.

Participants wanted to see the themes of the GLUT simulation game incorporated into their program decision-making and applications to their work in rural issues and policies. A suggestion was made to hand out the presentation materials before the exercise so that participants are more familiar with the land market concepts. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the USAID participants had a more difficult time with the GLUT game as they may not be as cognizant of urban land market issues. A total of 18 responses mentioned either GLUT or land markets when specifically asked “Which topics did we spend too much time on?”

2.5 OVERALL COURSE

Participants contributed extensive feedback and suggestions to the questions soliciting qualitative input (see Appendix 5). The highlights of participants’ training experiences varied and many participants mentioned particular modules or groups of modules they preferred. Ten responses noted land administration/markets and GLUT as a highlight. Several participants indicated their satisfaction with and the usefulness of learning about challenges and approaches being used in other African countries.

Participants had many suggestions regarding topics that could have been covered in greater detail. Four responses requested more time on conflict and four responses requested incorporating gender and vulnerable groups into other topical areas. The remaining suggestions varied and included land policy formulation, conservation, climate change, and land tenure tools and resources.

Participants indicated that the course focus on a broad array of themes was appropriate. One participant requested that a focus on the integration of land tenure reform into USAID programming would be helpful. Six participants indicated directly or indirectly that more time for the course was needed. To the question related to which topics were covered in too much depth, most responses (20) indicated GLUT or land markets. There appears to be somewhat of a split in participant opinion on this since land administration/markets also received the most requests for additional time. It is possible that participants are interested in less time on land markets and more time on land administration. While participants appeared to enjoy GLUT and value its lessons, they prefer to spend less time on the game.

When asked if they would recommend taking part in an interactive distance learning version of the course, the majority of the participants who replied (16 out of 20) said that they would recommend the course. Comments included notes on the limitations of internet speed and the inability of translating the GLUT simulation online. One participant recommended condensing the lectures into a handbook for easy access to the materials.

2.6 CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED FOR FUTURE REGIONAL COURSES

The Liberia training course maintained the same modular structure as the previous regional course held in Ecuador in 2011. New presentations were offered during this course ranging from the Conflict Prevention Handbook to the presentation on Large Scale Land Acquisition. Both were well received, well-scored and resulted in participatory discussions. These new modules, while adding subject matter to an already tight schedule, touch on issues that are being addressed in each of the participants' countries.

2.6.1 Improving Future LTPR Regional Short Courses

Overall high levels of satisfaction on the international courses suggest that the majority of their elements should be retained for future courses. In Liberia, participants were pleased with the variety of course modules and their rich content. The quality of the presentations was highly rated as was the quality of course trainers. On the whole, modules were relevant to participant professions. Nonetheless, there is always room for improvement. The majority of the recommendations that emerged from participant evaluations for improving future regional training experiences are repeated from previous courses. They include the following:

1. **Maintain variety of teaching tools:** Continue to vary the use of pedagogical tools. A wide range of tools (lectures, discussions, panel discussions, group discussions, field trips) provide a constantly changing educational climate conducive for adult learning. Constant variation keeps participants alert and engaged.
2. **Allow more time for discussion.** Consideration should be given to restricting the number of presentations/activities in each module, or shortening the presentations themselves, with a strict focus on best practice approaches, to allow more time for discussion, which is highly valued by participants.
3. **Incorporate field trips.** In order for participants to fully capture the topics being discussed appropriate field trips should be incorporated into the course schedule. Many participants commented on how

actually seeing a successful project or an unfolding land tenure issue would help drive home the points delivered in the presentations and provide for a more informed and lively discussion.

4. **Retain GLUT but spend less time on it.** The GLUT game was well received by participants; however, many participants felt that too much time was spent on this activity. Perhaps the simulation lacked a certain engagement because participants did not fully understand at the outset the rationale and rules due to inadequate advance review of the GLUT manual. Future courses should continue to incorporate GLUT but should reduce the amount of time spent playing it. Options for converting GLUT into a more rural-focused activity will also be pursued as this may be more appropriate for certain audiences.
5. **Increase time on land administration.** As with previous courses, participants requested additional time be spent on land administration. A case study presentation should be incorporated to intersperse theory with real-life examples. An additional presentation may need to be incorporated in this module that better addresses modern technologies and land administration tools.
6. **Emphasize best practices and applicability.** One of the key challenges in previous trainings was trying to convey best practices and practical tools for addressing complex LTPR challenges. While scores in this area were good, several participants requested more time be spent on land tenure best practices, frameworks, tools, and resources. The training organizers will continue to look into improving delivery of best practices in future LTPR trainings.
7. **Gender balance.** In the future, the course should try to achieve more of a gender balance in both the presenters and the participants.

2.6.2 Practices from Liberia to Replicate in Other Courses

The following suggestions ought to be incorporated into future courses. They were used in Liberia and worked well:

1. **Toys.** Recent research suggests that doodling and other creative uses of toys helps keep up energy, attention, and innovation. Participants enjoyed the toys.
2. **Printing Resource Manuals in the US.** This reduces the workload immediately prior to the course and the quality of the manual is probably higher with less missing or poorly organized pages.
3. **Time-off.** Finishing the course at 5:00 PM each day allows the participants to get out and around the town.
4. **Flash Disks of Information.** These were very much appreciated by participants.

APPENDIX I. TRAINING COURSE PARTICIPANTS

Name	Title/organization	Email address
1. Daniel Terrell	Senior Rule of Law and Land Conflict Resolution Advisor, DG/USAID Liberia	dterrell@usaid.gov
2. Laura Arntson	M&E Specialist and Mission Environmental Officer, USAID/Liberia	Larntson@usaid.gov
3. Xavier Preciado	Agriculture and Food Security Advisor, USAID/Mozambique	xpreciado@usaid.gov
4. Shawna Hirsch	Environment Officer, EGAT/USAID Liberia	shirsch@usaid.gov
5. Finley Y. Karngar	Rule of Law Advisor, DG/USAID Liberia	fkarngar@usaid.gov
6. Darlington S. Tuagben	Natural Resource Management Specialist, EGAT/USAID Liberia	dtuagben@usaid.gov
7. Jennifer Talbot	Forestry Advisor, EGAT/USAID Liberia	jtalbot@usaid.gov
8. Titus Zulu	Principal Forestry Officer, Forestry Department, Ministry of Environment and Climate Change, Government of Malawi	tituszl@yahoo.com , tituszulu2@gmail.com
9. Clifford Mkanthama	Program Officer III, Leadership for Environment and Development, University of Malawi	mkanthama@yahoo.com
10. Kabuye Kyofa	Oil Palm Coordinator, Vegetable Oil Development Project, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, Uganda	kkyofa@gmail.com
11. Stanley N. Toe	Program Office, Program and Policy, Land Commission, Liberia	snimleytoe@yahoo.com
12. Forkpa H. Kemah	Senior Executive Service, CNDRA, Liberia	fhkemah56@gmail.com
13. Tom-Wesley Korkpor	Special Assistant, Land Commission, Liberia	tomkorkpor@gmail.com
14. Butrus Apollo	Coordinator, National Land Commission, South Sudan	skyline1013@yahoo.com
15. Lual Guet Jok	Jonglei State Land and Investment Commissioner, South Sudan	jokguet@hotmail.com
16. Tiswen N. Synyenlentu	Program Officer, Land Administration, Land Commission, Liberia	tsynyenlentu@yahoo.com
17. David M. Beyan	Assistant Director, Bureau of Land Information & Training, MLME, Liberia	davidbeyanm@gmail.com
18. Florence Geegbae Dukuly	Deputy Minister of Urban Affairs, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Liberia	fdukuly_wvl@yahoo.com
19. Peter Doe-Somah	Technical Assistant, Ministry of Internal Affairs, Liberia	pdsumah2nd@yahoo.com

Name	Title/organization	Email address
20. Hood Luyima	District Natural Resources Officer, Luwero District, Uganda	dhililaks@yahoo.uk
21. Harriette Badio	Assistant Minister for Economic Affairs, Ministry of Justice, Liberia	Harriette.badio@yahoo.com
22. Peter Killen	Senior Resource Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Liberia	p.killen234@gmail.com
23. Eugene O. Cole	Governance Specialist, USAID PAGE, Sierra Leone	eugchris@yahoo.com
24. Amos Diggay Kamara	Assistant Conservator of Forests, Forestry Division – Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security, Sierra Leone	Kamaradiggay@yahoo.com
25. Fortune Pearson	National Coordinator, Land Coordination Center, Land Commission, Liberia	Fortunepearson1@gmail.com
26. Amos Garpou	Technical Coordinator, CNDRA, Liberia	amosgarpou@yahoo.com
27. Chea B. Garley	Assistant Minister for Technical Services, Ministry of Agriculture, Liberia	cheabrowngarleysr@yahoo.com
28. Edwin Baysah	Ministry of Agriculture, Liberia	
29. Emmanuel M. Beer	Program Assistant, Land Commission, Liberia	
30. Robert Gbarbea	Legal Consultant, Ministry of Justice, Liberia	robertgbarbea@yahoo.com
31. Dr. Cecil Othello Brandy	Chairman, Land Commission, Liberia	ctob@yahoo.com
32. Hon. Walter Y. Wisner	Vice Chairman, Land Commission, Liberia	Walterwisner2@yahoo.com
33. Hon. Estelle K. Liberty	Commissioner, Land Commission, Liberia	estellekliberty@yahoo.com
34. Hon. Lwopu Kandakai	Commissioner, Land Commission, Liberia	kandakail@yahoo.com
35. Hon. Suzana Vaye	Commissioner, Land Commission, Liberia	suzanavaye@ymail.com
36. Hon. Victor Helb	Commissioner, Land Commission, Liberia	Vhelb_42@yahoo.com

APPENDIX 2. BIOGRAPHIES OF TRAINING RESOURCE PERSONS

MARK FREUNDEBERGER

Dr. Mark S. Freudenberger is the chief of party for USAID's Property Rights and Resource Governance (PRRGP) task order implemented by Tetra ARD Inc. He brings to this position over 30 years of field experience in natural resource management in West Africa and Madagascar. Mark returned to take on the position with PRRGP after 11 years of managing USAID eco-regional conservation and development programs in Madagascar. He holds a PhD in regional planning and natural resource management from UCLA.

MICHAEL ROTH

Dr. Michael Roth is currently Director of the Land Tenure and Property Rights sector of Tetra Tech ARD. He obtained his PhD in Agricultural Economics in 1986 from Purdue University and spent 18 years at the University of Wisconsin's Land Tenure Center before joining ARD in 2005. He has organized numerous conferences and training events, and is widely known for his work on land policy, market development and tenure security.

MARK MARQUARDT

Dr. Mark Marquardt is the Chief of Party of the MCC-funded USAID Liberia Land Policy and Institutional Support Project. He has over 30 years of experience working on projects related to land tenure, land policy development, land law reform, and related institutional development including land registration programs, common property and buffer zone management issues, small holder agriculture and pastoralism. Dr. Marquardt holds a Ph.D. in Development Studies from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

DAVID BLEDSOE

David Bledsoe brings more than 15 years of experience in tenure policy, legislative and regulatory reform, and working with customary and common property regimes. As Africa Program Manager for Landesa, Mr. Bledsoe is actively engaged in efforts to improve land registration and other land administration functions, including land expropriation, land valuation and land-related institutional capacity building throughout Africa. Mr. Bledsoe holds a J.D. and an L.L.M. degree in Law of Sustainable Development.

CARLOS H. MORALES-SCHECHINGER

Carlos H. Morales-Schechinger is a land and housing expert at IHS (Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies) Erasmus University at Rotterdam, where he had been a visiting lecturer since 2004 and is now a full time senior expert since August 2008. He graduated with honours at UNAM, he did his MPhil on urban studies at the University of Edinburgh and specialized on local government financing at the University of Birmingham, UK

VANESKA LITZ

Ms. Vaneska N. Litz is the Deputy Chief of Party of USAID's PROSPER project in Liberia where she is responsible for technical program coordination and leader for all community forestry and land tenure

activities. She is a lawyer and natural resource management and policy professional with more than 15 years of experience working on community forest management projects at the community, national, and regional levels in Africa, Southeast Asia, and North America.

PETER GIAMPAOLI

Mr. Giampaoli is a Climate Change Specialist in the Land Tenure and Property Rights Division at USAID. He brings over 20 years of experience in South Sudan, Uganda, and Kenya on a range of natural resource, land policy and tenure issues. He holds a Master of Science degree in Forest Resources from Oregon State University, focusing on policy issues affecting smallholder forest owners.

APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

MODULE 1: Intro to Land Tenure and LTPR Concepts				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Concepts and definitions	103	25	4.12	There was clarity in content; needs time to synthesize and feel comfortable; it was nice and understandable; well organized and customized; more real examples could help enliven; good comprehensive summary - helps to include definitions in book for later reference
2. Introduction to LTPR tools	108	26	4.15	More time is needed for discussion; Tools were very easy to understand; more practice needed to internalize; perfect; would have liked more time to work through and discuss matrix; incorporate into other modules to build familiarity; This is what I was hoping for!
3. Discussion on LTPR constraints in participant countries	106	25	4.24	Need more time to familiarize with how to use the matrix; Tools were very easy to understand; good; need additional sessions
4: Liberia Case Study	106	24	4.42	Presentation was okay; very clear in content and presentation; well presented, very clear and informative - Bravo!; perfect; detailed knowledge of country history; need follow up mechanism for donor activities
5: Improved your knowledge and understanding of LTPR terms and concepts	111	26	4.27	Module 1 helped me expand my thinking about LTPR issues and constraints
6. Improved your understanding of common LTPR constraints faced in developing nations	104	25	4.16	More to learn
7: Relevancy of module to your work	114	26	4.38	Good; very relevant; Highly relevant, still quest for more
			4.25	

MODULE 2: Land and Natural Resource Conflict				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on land, natural resources and violent conflict	94	22	4.27	Presentation was ok
2: Video: PRADD Conflict Diamonds	102	23	4.43	Well understood, an excellent video
3: Discussion	95	23	4.13	Well understood, more time needed; We have discussed mineral and forest resources but I would be interested in more on water - ground water and surface water rights/disputes/resolutions. great engagement by participants; Limited time
4: Presentation on Land and Conflict Prevention Handbook	103	23	4.48	Ok, needs more info; Could be tied in to examples and tools; Made me want to read it. Excellent resource; Did not receive copy. Presentation very relevant.
5. Helped you understand resource-based conflicts and how resources either prompt or become the focus of conflict	89	22	4.05	
6: Improved your understanding of programmatic options for managing conflicts over resources and for resettling IDPs in a post-conflict environment	94	22	4.27	
7: Relevancy of module to your work	90	22	4.09	
			4.25	Overall: Presenters were very good, can easily apply to lots of other disciplines; More discussion on specifics of displacement/resettlement would have been interesting. It has been touched on, but not really explicitly discussed - particularly with respect to resource use; This is the focal point of my week; Need additional sessions

MODULE 3: Gender and VP				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on understanding vulnerability and the rights of women and vulnerable populations	86	20	4.30	Detailed articulation of facts; the materials expanded my knowledge of and thinking about working with vulnerable populations; the issues were well articulated; Very clear explanation as to why women separate; it is very important to mention in the constitution. Should have been a little longer
2: Video: Women's Land Rights	93	20	4.65	Quite practical and an eye opener, This was wonderful
3: Video: Villages on Front Lines Niger	91	20	4.55	NRM issues are universal and the solutions from NRM challenges can be applied anywhere; In this case it would be interesting to revisit - what is current situation? How secure are the rights of the women? What about when current chef du village is no longer there? The intervention was good, but ultimately what rights explicitly did they gain? Legal because there seemed to be uncertainty surrounding the women's ability to hold onto their claims once the land became productive again; This was amazing
4: Discussion	80	19	4.21	Participatory
Helped you understand the meaning of vulnerability in the context of LTPR	84	20	4.20	
Improved your understanding of why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS	81	20	4.05	
Helped you understand various policy, administrative, judicial, institutional and programmatic options for strengthening women's and other vulnerable groups' rights to land and resources	76	20	3.80	
8: Relevancy to your work?	76	18	4.22	
Urban Land Markets Presentation	78	17	4.59	Very interesting, the economic reasoning was helpful; Very dramatic and clear; Very audible; Very educational
			4.29	Overall: Vulnerable communities but focusing more on women was very exciting approach; Adaptation to CC has direct bearing to secure land tenure and property rights. Unclear tenure affects CC adaptation processes; Nice presentation; GLUT: Very engaging and informative; very good; well understood, clearly expose us to the issues; HIV/AIDS, nutrition, food security, health linkage weak.

MODULE 4: NRM				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation of LTPR Issues in NRM and biodiversity conservation	83	19	4.37	Good articulation of the contents; Well-articulated; Well organized and presented
2: Discussion	72	18	4.00	More debate that assisted in depth understanding; More Q&A; Participatory; Would have preferred representation of post-analysis.
3: Land Tenure and Global Climate Change	82	19	4.32	More of a discussion on carbon markets would have been interesting - many exports are focusing on REDD+ and will they really pan out?; I have full understanding
4. Discussion	73	18	4.06	Needed more time I suppose. More learning; perfect
5: NRM Case Study	84	19	4.42	Great! The Group exercise was good. I have full understanding
6: Helped you understand why property rights over natural resources are important to biodiversity conservation, good governance, economic growth, and adaptation and mitigation of climate change	85	19	4.47	
7: Improved your understanding of tenure related programmatic interventions to promote sustainable resource uses	80	19	4.21	
8: Relevancy to your work?	77	18	4.28	
			4.27	Overall: Relevant especially when we do enterprise development (on Land and Forests) and can't succeed without knowing rights and claims. Great all around! Very good. Very relevant

MODULE 5: Land Policy and Administration				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Presentation on land policy and administration	124	27	4.59	Presents a good framework; there was clarity; The planning stage well stated but implementation mechanisms not clear; Suggest that stakeholders at the grassroots level be educated and sensitized regarding the land ownership; excellent; great overall comprehensive presentation; well-presented and articulated; clear and relevant; presenter understands land issues
2: Discussion	110	26	4.23	Participatory; excellent; quite exciting and new insights in land??? formulation and impacts; real example I could relate
3: African Union's stances on tenure	105	26	4.04	What is the adoption by member states so far? provided hope for international support; not very clear link; concern with issue of enforcement
4: Voluntary Guidelines	109	28	3.89	Well thought out; Good
5: Presentation and discussion on large scale land acquisitions	123	28	4.39	It was an excellent presentation; Very relevant to what is happening with customary land; excellent; more debate but needed to be summarized; wasn't enough time; important area in relation to development; presenter well knowledgeable provoked a good argument
6: Discussion	97	21	4.62	Participatory; excellent; discussion assisted clarification. inviting and good for practitioners
Helped you understand the process, purpose and elements of a sound land policy and legislation, as well as the pros and cons of both customary and statutory land governance institutions	119	28	4.25	
Improved your understanding of why women's land rights matter, and the linkages between LTPR and HIV/AIDS	90	23	3.91	
Helped you understand programmatic interventions related to land policy and administration, and successful methods and technologies used in land administration	108	26	4.15	
Relevancy of module content to your work	111	26	4.27	

MODULE 5: Land Policy and Administration				
Question	Total Points Received	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
			4.24	Overall: it has been very informative. Scope of understanding these issues enhanced; why women and not others? Clearly this was a help; quite relevant to my work. Good and very good throughout. This was well articulated and relevant to our work. Not really impressed - could do more with examples. Women's land rights issues were revised as a side issue in today's discussion. More time for discussion is required next time. As these issues are complex further reading will assist; HIV/AIDS aspect didn't come out very clearly; good presentation - further reading is needed though; very relevant.

Overall Content				
Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
1: Introduction to Land Tenure and Property Rights (LTPR) Concepts	120	26	4.62	Presenter was not very audible; Content and presentation ok; Perfectly done
2: Land and natural resource conflict: How rights and access to land and resources can be the cause of conflict and can fuel conflict	116	26	4.46	well done; perfectly done
3: Gender and Vulnerable Populations: Strengthening Access to Land and Resources	103	26	3.96	Needed several examples from other countries in the region for variety; Well-presented and understandable; Too binominal male vs. female
4: Natural resource management: How tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources	110	26	4.23	Though rushed through, the high (score) is for content; Well-presented and understandable
5: Land policy and administration: A tool for managing property rights	116	26	4.46	An eye opener and makes life easy to find interventions; Well-presented and understandable
Land Markets – Gaining with Land Use Transactions Simulation	108.5	26	4.17	Great presenter though it was too long - but simplified learning; amazing tool! Perfectly done; incremental in relevance, induce better market understanding.
Exchange experiences, deepen discussion and strengthen understanding of land tenure and property rights issues, and their application to government and USAID programming	94	22	4.27	
Learn land tenure and property rights approaches, best practices and tools aimed at improving programmatic interventions on critical issues in the region related to natural resources, agriculture and economic growth, and governance and conflict	90	21	4.29	
Objectives were stated clearly	105	23	4.57	
Content of the training program	106	24	4.42	
Knowledge demonstrated by the course trainers	113	24	4.71	

Overall Content				
Question	TOTAL	Number of Respondents	Average score	Comments
Presentation style utilized by course trainers	99	22	4.50	
Relevancy of program content to your work	93	22	4.23	
Format for presentations and discussions was appropriate to the material	83	20	4.15	
Pre-course logistical coordination (invitation, travel arrangements, information provision, responsiveness, etc.)	91	22	4.14	
Logistical coordination during the course	88	20	4.40	
Quality of the conference facility	92	23	4.00	
Quality of conference services	83	22	3.77	
Quality of accommodations and hotel services	58	16	3.63	
Quality of food	83	24	3.46	
Overall, how would you rate your training program experience?	95	22	4.32	
			4.23	Overall: Maybe too much lecturing in some modules; Excellent presentation but recommend short duration for presentation; Expose participants to the techniques of land tenure and property rights; change by ensuring tenure security. It is important to dissuade climate change; Administration gives us some thoughts on Land; well-articulated and stimulating; well-articulated; exposed me to NRM skills; the women issue is still wanting; the venue was expensive, the surrounding hotels too - only rice was served throughout; my appreciation of the matter will help me use it; Much more relevant to my daily work; relevant to my work; Very relevant to my prospective future activities; Am more equipped and feel skilled for the new challenges before me on land and property rights.

What were the highlights for you from the six-day short course on Best Practices for Land Tenure and Natural Resource Governance in Africa?

- GLUT, Land Tenure.
- Useful tools and concepts
- Simulation exercise and matrix
- Discussions
- Nothing particular, all topics were very interesting
- The overview, land policy/administration and large-scale land acquisitions
- Modules 1 and 2 were very good and the highlights of hearing examples from participants from other parts of Africa during discussions was great
- Legal framework on land registrations and land use planning
- The highlights from the 4 day course: land markets - GLUT, land policy and administration
- Land markets - GLUT
- Land administration issues; land market techniques; the Nimba case studies
- The land tenure and property rights framework tools and resources presentation was exceptional, the course content, discussion and lesson learned from various case studies were very valuable
- NRM; land tenure system; land markets
- Land administration
- The simulation exercise was quite good. I need more of this for other government officials in the various sectors; e.g. agriculture, roads, etc.
- Land consolidation; land use planning - primarily detail masonry (?) which should be inclusionary and focuses on problematic areas
- The video snippets were good especially for the Niger women. The cowboys did not fully highlight the land conflict (as the original settlers Apache Indians) were not seen in the videos
- Security of tenure rights and why the vulnerable especially women need special attention
- Land, natural resources and conflict, climate change and its impact on land use and land tenure
- Land tenure, property rights and urban land markets
- Rights and access to land and resources major source of conflicts - true picture; strengthening access to land and resources by ?????; land markets are sophisticated and the rule of the game is exploitative - simulation; land administration policy and regulations in land acquisition and grabbing
- The highlights for me were land administration issues, urban planning, and land tenure issues, etc.
- The framework to harmonize the varied number of tenure systems is still a challenge; governments must demonstrate willingness to engage the customary system actively and transparently; markets could not be avoided, so one must understand it for just development
- Land Market

What topics (if any) would you have liked for us to have covered in greater detail?

- Tell us what the best practice is
- More on land conflict resolution and prevention
- More on the legal aspect
- Dispute resolution
- Tools for land policy formulation
- I think consciously incorporating gender and vulnerable communities into other topics would have helped. Larger periods allowed for discussions - too often the discussions were cut short
- The land/property registrations
- NRM: how tenure security can promote conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources

- None
- Land policy and administration
- I would have liked for the Africa Union Declaration on Issues and Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa presentation to highlight in more detail the terms or agreements made by the AU
- Land markets
- Land administration; property rights and natural resource conflict
- Land tenure and property rights - needed more examples that are typical in Liberia
- Land rights for women and vulnerable populations
- Module 2 - with case studies from other African countries
- Climate change vs land use practices and tenure
- Modules 2 and 3
- Land resources (forest, water, wildlife) and ecosystem services valuation
- I would have liked the introduction to land tenure and property rights
- Land policy and administration - a tool for managing property rights
- Land tenure and property rights frameworks, tools and resources; Land, natural resources and violent conflict; land rights for women and vulnerable populations (especially slum populations)
- The impact of climate change arrangements (mitigation) on land tenure
- Gender and vulnerable population

What topics (if any) did we spend too much time on?

- GLUT (x19) (comments: I would have rather had a brief simulation and a more in-depth discussion on the topic; very interesting but maybe too much; the game is maybe a 2 day exercise; the second day the lessons were already coming out; much time was spent on land markets however to the benefit of trainees - especially me; and, at first I thought the simulation was too long, but then I started understanding why, and it was good)
- Relatively equal time on all topics
- Biodiversity Conservation
- NRM

Did you feel that the four-day training course encompassing a broad array of themes was helpful, or would you prefer that future course offerings have a narrower thematic focus? If the latter, on which theme(s) in particular?

- Yes, it encompasses a broad array of themes.
- Maybe separate into two modules: 1. land conflicts and basics and 2. markets and basics
- This was very helpful
- The successful integration of land tenure reform into USAID programming (donor specific) and presentation from local government representatives on their struggles to reform and implement
- Dispute resolution
- Focus should be on specific thematic areas
- I think a five-day course would have allowed for greater discussion time
- Yes, it was very helpful and this training course encompasses a broad array of themes indeed
- The four-day training course encompassing a broad array of themes would help. It gives me a broad eye view about diverse issues on land tenure, policy and land markets.
- The four day training course encompassing a broad array of themes was very helpful
- The four-day themes were helpful. I would have preferred two weeks to provide us more details.
- Yes!! The introductory course was very informative. It presented numerous issues, challenges, and possible solutions to dealing with land conflicts, management, administration, markets, policies, etc.

- Yes it was helpful; I was able to appreciate the NRM skills better, and how they relate to each other
- It was helpful, I wish we could have more time to discuss them in detail
- Next seminar should focus on LTPR
- The course was helpful but the time allotted for presentations was inadequate
- The combinations were excellent, but I would have preferred a field visit into the countryside (if safe) so that we have some physical/practical learning and refreshing moments as well. I feel we spent too much time sitting down in the four walls!
- Very helpful themes, new and relevant to my work
- The latter, especially modules 2 & 3
- Yes. However, I think the land resources valuation should make up a separate module
- Yes, it was helpful
- Yes, was beyond useful but need to expand it a bit because time is not enough
- Yes, very much helpful and increases my understanding as one who joined the urban development just recently
- It was well selected and programmed
- There should be enough time for the course

How did you like the venue as a training facility?

- The venue was good but lunch and tea were poorly prepared.
- Good
- Not very much but not much choice
- I think the venue was good
- Great
- This is a good venue for courses. The intermittent microphone was the only real problem
- Yes. I loved this venue as the training facility because it represents a learning environment
- Excellent
- The venue and training facility was excellent!
- It was sufficient; only that it was a little expensive especially for some of us who could not get sponsors
- Somewhat
- Good, however I would have preferred some place far away from my office
- The venue of the training was somehow okay
- Good place - as we were accommodated close to the venue
- Good location but could have a better variety of food choices
- Yes
- Excellent
- It was good
- Appropriate but a university venue will be more attractive
- The venue was secluded and helped to increase concentration
- The venue is somehow good. Liberians found it difficult to transport to the training center

Please provide any additional suggestions regarding how this training could be improved

- 1. Civil society organization should be targeted group for attendance. 2. Rural women/inhabitants should be invited. 3. Taking traffic into consideration, the course should start around 9 am in Liberia. 4. Agenda about the course should be sent prior to commencement of the course. 5. The course should be carried out in countries with related situation so as to learn from the success story. Land issues in Africa are not the same.

- Teach us the best practice in Liberia
- Include more questions and participatory discovery into lectures
- Yes
- Add more interactive sessions
- I think more in depth discussion of peri-urban areas would be very relevant, especially in the Africa context
- Let it be more interactive with participants
- This training could be improved by allotting more days for example one week
- With the exception of the GLUT taking up much time, I have no additional comments. The course was excellent, as well as the presenters
- At least for foreign participation it should be considered for an allowance to help them come
- More time should be allocated to discuss important issues like conflict resolution, property rights and land administration
- The simulation component should cover more time/topics
- Enough time
- Field learning
- May need to put in one or two field visits
- The process is well organized; for improvement increase the training days
- The training should provide some stipend for the participants especially those from the host country
- Should be a three month course with some tests and collaborative with a university especially those handling land issues to award an academic certification to enable us to expand the scope
- Perhaps to increase some of the dialogue boxes for better reading and understanding
- For the local people, participants should be given some subsidies to facilitate the travel to the training center

We are considering developing an interactive distance learning version of the course to offer to those unable to attend the live classes. Would this be something you would recommend to your colleagues? If not, why not?

- Yes (x15) (comments included: I would like to spend less time on GLUT; Only where the internet is fast enough; I would, with all of my added ideas and experiences; It is a very good recommendation; carry on; I will recommend this to my colleagues; Immediately I got to know of it!!!; it is quite a great course; Absolutely, though it's much better to understand when you can watch Carlos demonstrate the principles of the markets than simply get a lecture on that).
- A short condensed lecture and handbook would be good. Some of the lectures were too prolonged and slow to introduce some materials.
- I would encourage them to do so. My concern would be technological - what are the internet speeds, etc. But land is such a critical issue, the more people that can be exposed to land issues, the better
- Yes This course is a practical course; therefore interactive distance learning will not be good
- Strongly recommend especially for NRM institutions and organizations

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov